

Appl. No. 10/803067  
Reply to Office action of 10/31/2005  
Page 6

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 4-5 and 9 are amended. Claims 6-8 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 10-11 are added. Claims 1-5 and 9-11 are pending.

#### I. Amendments

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors.

The amendments to claim 1 are supported by the original disclosure, for example page 7, lines 23-31; page 8, line 12; and Figures 1 and 9.

The amendments to claims 4 and 5 are grammatical in nature.

The amendments to claim 9 are supported by the original disclosure, for example page 7, lines 23-31; page 8, line 12; and Figures 1 and 9. Claim 9 is also amended to provide consistent use of means language.

New claim 10 is a combination of original claims 1 and 2. New claim 11 is supported by original claim 3.

No new matter has been added.

#### II. Election

The election of species A, claims 1-5 and 9 is acknowledged. New claims 10-11 are readable on the elected specie.

#### III. 35 USC 112 rejection

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to remove "any one of".

The claims are definite. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Appl. No. 10/803067  
Reply to Office action of 10/31/2005  
Page 7

#### IV. Prior art rejections

Claims 1, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ushijima et al. (US 4,083,184).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Ushijima et al. (US 4,083,184).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

With respect to claims 1 and 9, Ushijima does not disclose a reed valve where the rib projects beyond a surface of the support substrate (claim 1) or the support means (claim 9) opposite the one surface at which the reed (claim 1) or reed means (claim 9) covers the valve hole.

In the rejection, the material of the substrate 56 of Ushijima between the holes 64 is characterized as the rib, and element 68 is characterized as the reed. However, in Ushijima, the material/rib between the holes 64 does not project beyond a surface of the substrate 56 that is opposite the one surface at which the reed 68 covers the valve hole 64. Instead, the material between the holes 64 is level with the surrounding substrate 56 surface and does not project beyond the surface of the substrate.

For at least this reason, claims 1 and 9 are not anticipated by Ushijima. Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are patentable along with claim 1 and need not be separately distinguished at this time. Applicants do not concede the propriety of the rejections to claims 4 and 5.

#### V. Claims 10 and 11

The indicated allowability of claims 2 and 3 is gratefully noted. Claim 10 is a combination of claims 1 and 2, and claim 11 is similar to claim 3. As a result, claims 10 and 11 should be in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/803067  
Reply to Office action of 10/31/2005  
Page 8

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: January<sup>23</sup>, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902-0902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 455-3800

By: *Curtis B. Hamre*

Curtis B. Hamre  
Reg. No. 29,165  
CBH/jal